DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 724 EA 024 531

AUTHOR Prusoff, Linda L.; Sumner, Gerald C.
TITLE State Education Agency Involvement in Change Agent Programs. Study of Change Agent Programs: A Working Note.
INSTITUTION Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO WN-8661-HEW
PUB DATE Apr 74
CONTRACT HEW-OS-73-216
NOTE 84p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Role; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Programs; *Program Administration; Program Implementation; *State Agencies; *State Departments of Education

ABSTRACT

Findings of a study that examined the role of the state education agency (SEA) in implementing innovative projects within school districts are presented in this paper. The following federal programs were investigated: (1) the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) Title III, Innovative Projects; (2) ESEA Title VII, Bilingual Projects; (3) Vocational Education (VEA) Part D, Exemplary Programs; and (4) the Right-to-Read program. Data were collected from telephone interviews with 48 state program officers in 18 states. Findings indicate that federal policies about dissemination of successful projects have caused major conflicts between the states and the federal program staff. Across all programs, state program staff reported the need for more federal program staff contact, a more active federal role in dissemination, and less rigid requirements. A conclusion is that SEA practices and policies affect local programs and that federal policy should recognize the diverse SEA needs and expertise. Research questions for each program are listed. Eight tables are included. The appendices contain a description of the survey instrument, the interview schedule, and a summary of SEA management of VEA state-administered Part D funds. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED352724

WN-8661-HEW

April 1974

STATE EDUCATION AGENCY INVOLVEMENT IN CHANGE AGENT PROGRAMS

Linda L. Prusoff
Gerald C. Sumner

STUDY OF CHANGE AGENT PROGRAMS

A WORKING NOTE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

This Note was prepared for the U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION under Contract HEW-OS-73-216. It is intended to facilitate communication of preliminary research results. Views or conclusions expressed herein may be tentative and do not represent the official opinion of the sponsoring agency.

Rand
SANTA MONICA, CA. 90406

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WN-8661-HEW

April 1974

STATE EDUCATION AGENCY INVOLVEMENT IN CHANGE AGENT PROGRAMS

Linda L. Prusoff
Gerald C. Sumner

PREFACE

Education change agent programs are sponsored by the federal government to introduce or spread innovative practices at the local school district level. This two-year study, being conducted by Rand under HEW/OE sponsorship, is designed to determine what characteristics of the programs themselves, the innovations they support, or the districts that adopt them, lead to successful implementation and continuation.

Data concerning State Education Agency (SEA) characteristics and managerial practices were collected over the telephone by interviewing state program officers in 18 states. In the Working Note, the results of these interviews are presented. These data will serve both to inform federal officials and to direct the SEA fieldwork that Rand plans to undertake this summer.

CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

Section
I. INTRODUCTION 1
Project Governance 2
Major Responsibility: SEA 2
Major Responsibility: OE 2

II. SEA MANAGEMENT STYLES 4
Title VII (Bilingual) 4
SEA Response 4
Vocational Education: Part D 7
Title III 9
Generation of Projects 10
Proposals 10
Project Selection 13
Project Management 15
Right-to-Read 15
SEA Response 18
State Legislation Related to Federal Programs 21
The Tally 21
Observations 22

III. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAM STAFF 27
Attitudes Toward Federal Guidelines 27
Conflicts 28
Right-to-Read 28
Title III 28
Vocational Education 32
Reactions to Federal Staff 32
Unmet Needs 32

IV. OBSERVATIONS 35
OE-Governed Programs 35
Right-to-Read 36
Title VII 36
SEA-Governed Programs 38

Appendix
A. DESCRIPTION OF THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT 40
B. SEA MANAGEMENT OF VEA STATE-ADMINISTERED PART D FUNDS ... 71

I. INTRODUCTION

In examining the processes of innovation and dissemination in the public schools, several policy arenas and the links among them must be understood. Federal innovative policies focus finally on the local level, but they are greatly influenced by the program goals and management policies of both the federal and State Education Agency (SEA) offices responsible for change agent programs.

This Working Note focuses upon the role of the SEA in the change agent process. We want to understand the ways (if at all) SEA policy affects the implementation of innovative projects within school districts. To accomplish this task, we need to analyze the processes within SEAs to identify those aspects of the educational system susceptible to change and to determine which aspects of the SEAs structure and processes affect the implementation of innovative projects, in what ways, and to what extent.

Toward this end, data concerning SEA characteristics and managerial practices were collected over the telephone, by interviewing state program officers in 18 states. In this Working Note, the results of these interviews are presented. These data will serve both to direct the SEA fieldwork that Rand plans to undertake this summer, and to provide a first-cut at outlining answers to the larger policy issues raised above.

The following four programs were examined: Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Title III, Innovative Projects; ESEA Title VII, Bilingual Projects; Vocational Education (VEA) Part D, Exemplary Programs, and the Right-to-Read program. Appendix A contains a technical description of the interview procedure and a copy of the survey instrument.

SEAs are not equally involved in each of the four federal programs, nor does the SEA have full discretion over funds or policies in any of the four programs. In four cases (Right-to-Read; Title VII; Federal VEA, Part D; and Federal Title III) OE awards funds directly to the

LEA. In two cases (State VEA, Part D, and State Title III), funds and varying degrees of direction are given to the SEA, which then funds projects in LEAs. In addition, the four programs represent widely varied program goals and management strategies--from highly specific programmatic goals (elimination of illiteracy) to highly general ones (support of innovative activities), from federal specification of protocol to a federal laissez-faire management policy. SEA responses to the survey questions about their relations with OE and about their own management styles mirror the diversity of intent and administration seen at the federal level.

PROJECT GOVERNANCE

Major Responsibility: SEA

In the state portions of Title III and VEA Part D, federal monies are turned over to the states for project selection and administration. Differences in management style are discussed in Section II.

Major Responsibility: OE

In four instances (Right-to-Read, Title VII, the federal portion of VEA Part D, and the federal portion of Title III), legislation specifies that project selection and administration remain a federal responsibility. Since no federal money is provided to the SEAs for administrative support, the SEA role in part becomes a matter of its own initiative and ability to reroute funds for administration from other sources. In part, SEA participation becomes a function of both perceived and actual propriety. That is, when OE awards program monies directly to the LEA, some SEAs assume it is their job to monitor the project and will do so; others make the same assumption yet feel frustrated that they "cannot" monitor the project; and still others assume with relief that these OE-LEA direct awards require neither their interest nor responsibility.

The range of SEA participation in these projects from our sample runs from either no expressed interest--or interest only because the site has problems that the SEA must solve--(Federal Title III) to

expressed interest but "forbidden" participation (most Right-to-Read) to SEA exclusion of federal officials from visiting their own sites without SEA permission (some Federal VEA, Part D). At the least, the SEA evaluates proposals and sends recommendations to the federal program office for new Title VII and Federal VEA, Part D projects. At the most, the SEA monitors these projects at its own expense, partially relieving the federal office of its workload.

II. SEA MANAGEMENT STYLES*

TITLE VII (BILINGUAL)

Title VII (Bilingual Education) provides funds to LEAs for programs that meet "the special education needs" of children who (1) have limited English-speaking ability, (2) come from environments where the dominant language is not English, and (3) come from low-income families. Almost all projects funded under this legislation incorporate bilingual or multilingual classroom instruction. No administrative money is provided to SEAs.

SEA Response

Representatives from eight states were interviewed. The interviewee was typically the person with major responsibility for whatever role the SEA plays in Title VII. In most cases, "bilingual" appeared somewhere in the interviewee's title, but there were also Title I and Title III officials. A summary of response to some questionnaire items is presented in Table 1.

Seven of the eight SEAs have some funded responsibility for bilingual education, either through Title I--Migrant, Title III, or state funding. Florida, however, has no state bilingual program, notwithstanding a large locally funded program for Cuban emigres in Dade County, two Title VII classroom projects, and a Title VII curricula development center in Miami Beach.

Most of the respondents reported that their states were orienting, or preferred to orient, bilingual education toward providing transition into the dominant Anglo culture. This would normally imply that bilingual classrooms would not extend beyond the third grade except for point-of-entry districts where immigrant children may be in advanced grades.

More in keeping with the philosophies of Title VII staff, California and Colorado SEA espouse the more comprehensive maintenance-of-cultural-plurality orientation. New Jersey and New York voiced sentiments in this direction, but it was not clear that it was the express stance of the SEA.

---

*All persons interviewed were assured that their response would be confidential. States are named only with the permission of the person interviewed.

Table 1

RESPONSES OF STATE OFFICIALS TO SELECTED ITEMS ABOUT TITLE VII

Questionnaire Items	States[a]							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Goal orientation of SEA								
Transition			X		X	X	X	
Maintenance	X	X		X(?)	X(a major city)			
State legislation								
Mandatory bilingual program			X			X		
Voluntary bilingual program	X				X			
Additional legislation planned		X		X	X	X		
Title VII "important" to SEA	X	X	X		X			
Frequency of SEA site visitation (per year)	3-4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Gripes toward federal Title VII staff								
Too few site visits	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Ignorant of "real" situation at sites	X	X						
Don't follow SEA recommendations	X		X					
Guidelines too flexible	X		X					
Subject to political pressure	X				X		X	
Oriented to West and Southwest						X	X	
Not enough substantive help					X	X	X	
Favorable results of Title VII								
Push state legislation			X	X	X	X		
Technical trailblazing	X	X		X		X		
Proof that bilingual education works	X	X	X					
Changes in attitudes			X		X	X		
Manpower training	X	X					X	
Specific needs for Title VII								
More site visits by Feds	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Better national plan	X						X	
Better site evaluation		X					X	
Better extra-site supervision	X			X				
Better staffing				X			X	

[a]These questionnaire items called for volunteered (open-ended) response. Thus, the lack of a particular response for a given state does not necessarily mean the response is irrelevant for that state, only that it is apparently less important.

The names of the states are concealed to respect the privacy of the respondents.

The interviewer was left with the impression that the bilingual education staffs in some SEAs had political as well as educational aims for the program; in their view, the employment as well as the educational opportunities arising from Title VII ought to be directed toward ethnic target groups; this bias was reflected in some of the complaints about federal Title VII staff.

In criticizing the Title VII program and staff, the eight SEAs interviewed seem to split rather cleanly into West and East, and somewhat ambiguously into four regions, West (California, Colorado and Texas), Midwest (Michigan), East (Massachusetts, New Jersey, and New York), and Southeast (Florida).

In the West, Title VII seems to figure importantly in the SEAs' own agendas, and accordingly those SEAs devote considerable staff time for monitoring projects, including regular site visits, workshops, and the like. The SEAs' concerns are with providing training, responding to specific calls for assistance, expediting the flow of materials around the state, and assuring that projects conform to the intent of the Title VII guidelines. Although they do attempt to impose a degree of control over the projects, they in fact have no jurisdiction, and must appeal to the federal Title VII office for action.

The main complaint of the Westerners is that there are too few site visits by the federal Title VII staff. They agree that the federal staff is very accessible by telephone and correspondence, but insist that greater site presence is necessary to have a real empathy for what is going on at the project level. This complaint seems to reduce in large part to a desire for more effective control over projects. The Title VII LEA guidelines, which are necessarily broadly constructed in order to accommodate the needs of bilingual education throughout the nation, are viewed as being too flexible to serve as an effective device for control. If a SEA wishes to reprimand a project and is not able to invoke the guidelines, it must appeal to the federal program office. The federal staff allegedly does not always follow SEA recommendations, both with respect to punitive action (i.e., project termination) and to selection of new projects; some federal resistance is said to be due to "political pressure."

In the East (and Midwest and Southeast), Title VII does not fit as importantly into the SEA schemes of things, and staff time is devoted to Title VII projects only when convenient in connection with their ministerings to bilingual projects for which they are funded (e.g., Title III, Title II--Migrant). No regular visitation is carried on at Title VII sites.

As in the West, the Eastern SEAs all complain that there is too little site visitation by the federal program office. But where the Westerners seemed mostly concerned with keeping projects in line, the motivation for Eastern complaint seems to be that with greater site presence, federal officers become more sensitive to the special needs of bilingual education in those states. Two respondents characterized Title VII as being a program designed for the West and Southwest, a Chicano program. The Michigan respondent claimed that the dispersed nature of target populations in the Midwest, in contrast to both East and West, presented special problems that are not equitably accommodated in the guidelines. One respondent felt that Title VII needed more people, not for better supervision, but for more ideas. Another noted that there needs to be more day-to-day assistance especially with respect to curriculum, and "more form and less format;" "the disease of bilingual education is conventional or conservative teaching practices." As in the West, there was some complaint that the federal staff is vulnerable to political influence, presumably with respect to Western bias as well as the selection of new projects.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION: PART D

Part D monies fund projects that demonstrate activities in career education in existing school settings. Funds are divided among the states according to a formula partially based on population. Within each state's allotment, the SEA administers half of the funds; OE administers the other half.

The federal portion. For the federally administered funds, OE invites school districts to submit proposals, and in the majority of

cases the best proposal from each state and territory is funded.* The input of the states in project generation and selection varies. Apart from sending prospective applicants a brief manual on how to write a proposal, and a booklet describing some Part D projects, OE does not give any systematic assistance in the development of proposals; the responses to the telephone survey indicated that the degree to which the SEA does give assistance becomes a good measure of how much they regard the project as their own. In some instances, OE project selection is pro forma; proposals are sent to the SEA, which has the option of selecting only the best proposals to forward to Washington. Some states in effect choose the federal project by forwarding what is in their opinion the best proposal. On the other hand, two of the twelve states interviewed stated they had no knowledge about the federal project because of federal policy of direct award to the LEA, and they expressed displeasure with this system.

The state portion. With the state portion of Voc. Ed., Part D funds, the SEA solicits proposals and funds and monitors projects with very little contact from the federal office. They may put their money into the federal project, into one large state project, or into many small state projects.

Since OE does not specify state management strategy, there occurs wide variation among the SEAs in administering Part D funds. Two basic models of state management strategies can be distinguished: states that are not committed to the concept of career education, and those that are.**

1. *Commitment to career education.* The staff takes a very active involvement in soliciting new projects. This activity runs the gamut from assuring that each LEA submits a proposal to prescribing which LEAs will have projects. The SEA staff may assist with, or participate in the writing of the proposal.

---

*Federal monies did support a certain number of projects in model cities areas of some large metropolises. This was based on an agreement between OE and a group of urban state senators.

**Specifics of individual state strategies are detailed in Appendix B.

Only one SEA follows a formal selection procedure.* For the most part, having been closely involved in project development, the staff knows which ones they will fund. These projects receive much SEA attention--both on-site presence and technical assistance.

2. *Lack of Commitment to Career Education.* LEAs are notified of the availability of funds for career education projects. The LEA initiates the request for funds. For the most part, project selection proceeds informally, with the final decision resting on the staff. Very little in technical assistance or on-site presence is provided.

TITLE III

Title III has no programmatic goals; activities for which Title III funds can be spent are prescribed by law: supplementary centers and services; exemplary elementary and secondary school educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs; and testing, guidance, and counseling programs. Rand's change agent study focuses on exemplary classroom programs. Management of local projects is decentralized to the SEAs; at the same time, a management process is imposed on the states. The federal requirements are:

1. A needs assessment of educational problems in the state. These results must be used in determining program priorities.
2. A prescribed method for selecting projects.
3. Development of requirements for internal project evaluations that satisfy certain federal guidelines.
4. Development of a procedure for selecting successful projects (and parts of projects) for dissemination.
5. Development of a plan for disseminating exemplary projects to school districts throughout the state.
6. Periodic evaluation of the success of their Title III program activities.**

---

*This SEA is less involved with the specifics of proposal development than the other SEAs in this group.

**Section 305(a)(1) of PL 91-230.

In addition to this management strategy being written into legislation, the states are legislatively required to submit a detailed plan (the State Plan) that describes how they will manage their program. If the State Plan is not satisfactory, OE can withhold the state's appropriation until the Plan is approved.

Generation of Projects*

Legislation requires the states to conduct assessments of their educational needs and use the results in allocating Title III funds. Results of querying SEA change agent officers about how they utilize the results of their needs assessment, and other project activities, are reflected in Table 2. Despite legislative mandate, two of eighteen Title III coordinators stated that their state has not performed a needs assessment; one qualified his comment by explaining that there was some activity in this area--but he would not call it a needs assessment. Strong feelings favoring LEA autonomy characterize both these states.

Results of the needs assessment are reflected in all but two states, which have not yet completed their needs assessment. Of the five states that are not satisfied with the quality of their needs assessment, two have completed this task.

Of the 18 states in our sample, fourteen do and four do not assist districts in planning new projects, and five do not suggest priorities to local districts concerning which kinds of projects will be funded. In these last two categories, states C, E, and I overlap. Possible reasons for this lack of early intervention in project formation include: political culture, weak SEA staff, and those tasks remain a function of service centers (also funded by Title III monies).

Proposals

Data collected about proposal receipt and funding are reflected in Table 3. Unlike the Part D projects, Title III groupings do not

*Questions 5-7 in the survey instrument.

Table 2

TITLE III PROJECT GENERATION

Program	State[a]																	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R
Title III																		
Needs assessment (NA)																		
Yes	X			X		X	X		X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No					X						X							
In process		X	X					X										
Results in state Funding priorities																		
Yes	X	X		X		X	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
No			X					X										
Somewhat									X									
Satisfied with quality of NA																		
Yes	X			X		X	X	X							X			X
No		X							X	X							X	
Somewhat			X									X	X	X		X		
Assist districts in project planning																		
Yes	X	X		X		X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
No			X		X				X					X				
Sometimes																		
Suggest priorities to LEAs																		
Yes	X	X		X		X	X	X		X	X		X	X		X	X	X
No			X		X				X			X			X			
Sometimes																		

[a]The names of the states are concealed to respect the privacy of the respondents.

Table 3

PROPOSAL HISTORY OF STATES, FISCAL YEAR 1973
STATE TITLE III AND VEA, PART D

	Number of Proposals			
	0-10	11-50	51-100	100+
Title III state				
Proposals received	4	5	4	5
Proposals funded	8	8	1	1
VEA state				
Proposals received	5	3	1	1
Proposals funded	3	4	2	1

necessarily reflect SEA predilection for funding large numbers of small projects or investing in a small number of large projects. In five Title III states interviewed, the number of proposals received is a function either of state program staff strategy or SEA or LEA uncertainty over federal funding allocations.

Two states chose to follow a funding cycle in awarding Title III monies; new projects are chosen for funding every three years. Fiscal year 1973, the year for which we collected data, did not begin a new cycle. Therefore, SEA response to number of proposals received and funded was zero for these states. One state used fiscal year 1973 funding to diffuse 15 third-year Title III projects throughout their school system. Doubts about whether Congress would continue Title III as a federal program reduced by 80 percent the number of proposals received by one state; this fiscal uncertainty led another state to fund no new projects.

Project Selection

Federal regulations specify that proposals must be reviewed by (1) a panel of experts in the area of the proposal, (2) the state Title III staff, and (3) the State Advisory Council. The results of this review must be presented to the CSSO or his deputy for final approval. In all states interviewed, the panel of experts was drawn from outside the SEA, most typically selected by the state program staff. As Table 4 shows, the State Advisory Council plays a major role in program selection in all but four states. Chief state school officers seldom change these recommendations.

Approximately two-thirds of the Title III coordinators stated that either geographic distribution quotas or other political guidelines were used in selecting projects to fund.* Another two-thirds reported receiving pressure from special interest groups;** only three

*Fifty percent of the VEA, Part D state officials made the same response.

**Forty percent of the VEA, Part D state officials made the same response; nine reported receiving a lot of pressure.

Table 4

PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS--TITLE III[a]

Major Decisionmaker	States																	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R
Selection of outside readers																		
CSSO role																		
AC role			X			X	X				X		X					X
Program staff role	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Outside readers role						X									X			
Project selection																		
CSSO role							X					X	X					
AC role	X	X	X	X	X			X		X	X	X	X	X	X			X
Program staff			X			X		X		X		X	X				X	X
Outside readers						X			X			X	X			X		
Political guidelines?																		
Yes	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X				X	X
No		X						X				X		X	X	X		
Interest group? Pressures																		
Yes			X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X			X	X	
No	X	X			X							X		X	X			X

[a]These questionnaire items called for volunteered (open-ended) response. Thus, the lack of a particular response for a given state does not necessarily mean the response is irrelevant for that state, only that it is apparently less important.

The names of the states are concealed to respect the privacy of the respondents.

reported receiving much pressure. Most of the pressure comes from the legislature and LEAs.

Six states reported using neither political nor geographic guidelines in funding projects. Of the eight states in our sample that have a popularly elected CSSO, four report neither political nor geographic guidelines nor interest group pressure.

Project Management

There are very few federal requirements in Title III for managing on-going projects. States can visit projects as often as they like and offer technical assistance or not. State Plan regulations make mandatory one on-site visit per project each year to verify project evaluation results. Most states visit their projects for monitoring purposes at least once or twice a year. In addition, one-third of the Title III states in our sample use a third-party evaluator. Table 5 summarizes results of responses to questions about project management.

Fifteen of the eighteen states in our sample have terminated projects for reasons shown on Table 6. Given that Title III funds are awarded competitively, this is not surprising. On the VEA, Part D program, on the other hand, projects tend to be "cultivated;" only two states have (once) terminated a project.

RIGHT-TO-READ

Of the four programs we examine, Right-to-Read has the most specific (albeit global) goal: elimination of illiteracy by 1980. To attain this goal, Right-to-Read plans to support or is supporting three kinds of projects: model reading programs in LEAs, training programs in SEAs, and teacher education improvement programs in universities.

Initially Right-to-Read established model reading programs (school-based sites) in LEAs to demonstrate the effectiveness of the

Table 5

PROJECT MANAGEMENT POLICIES--TITLE III

	States[a]																
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R
Frequency of site visitation (per year)	18	2	1	1-2	2	2	5+	6	3	3	(b)	(c)	2	(d)	1	2	1+	2+
Purpose of visitation[e]																		
Monitoring	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X
Solve problems	X	X				X	X	X		X								
Liaison															X	X		
Dissemination			X															
Project monitoring[e]																		
On-site visits	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Standardized monitoring form	X							X							X			
Review of continuation proposals														X		X		
Required status reports		X		X	X	X	X			X		X	X					X
Phone calls														X		X		
Regional project director meetings										X								

[a] The names of the states are concealed to respect the privacy of the respondents.

[b] No set policy

[c] Every few days

[d] Almost 0

[e] These questionnaire items called for volunteered (open-ended) response. Thus, the lack of a particular response for a given state does not necessarily mean the response is irrelevant for that state, only that it is apparently less important.

Table 6

REASONS FOR PROJECT TERMINATION--TITLE III[a]

	States																	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R
Misuse of funds		X											X	X				
Evaluation faults	X							X										
Inability to evaluate		X																
Disagreement over project objectives											X							
Unwillingness of LEA to make financial commitment		X									X							
Community pressure																X		
Staff conflict				X			X											X
Loss of key personnel			X				X							X				
None of the above (e.g., general remarks about not meeting project objectives)					X		X	X		X	X[b]					X	X	
No terminations						X			X						X			

[a]These questionnaire items called for volunteered (open-ended) response. Thus, the lack of a particular response for a given state does not necessarily mean the response is irrelevant for that state, only that it is apparently less important.

The names of the states are concealed to respect the privacy of the respondents.

[b]Terminated project was initially funded by OE. No state-funded Title III project has been terminated.

Right-to-Read method for achieving reading improvement in a range of schools across the country.*

However, it soon became clear that this plan alone did not provide sufficient leverage for the federal elimination-of-illiteracy effort. Although continued through their second-year of funding, the school-based sites were no longer expected to be the major means of achieving overall program goals, and activities were stepped up in other aspects of the program.

Since the questionnaire survey and fieldwork tasks in the change agent study are primarily designed to provide information on the success of local projects and relate success to variables in the structure of the projects and in the local school organizational environment, our telephone surveys focused on the SEA and its relationship with and reaction to these model reading programs. In presenting the state Right-to-Read directors' responses to the questionnaire, it should be kept in mind that we are focusing on only *one* aspect of the program.

SEA Response

From the perspective of the Right-to-Read directors in the SEAs, the school-based sites have failed as an exemplary program for the state.** The consensus seems to be that this failure stems from the "you go your way and I'll go mine" attitude of OE towards the SEAs. As a result, school-based sites were most often typified as isolated

---

*Among the change agent programs we examine, generation and selection of these model projects is unique. Proposals as such were not called for; rather, schools were nominated by a state official (e.g., the Chief State School Officer or a district superintendent). OE, however, made the final selection of schools and specified the procedural steps to follow in developing a reading improvement program. The SEA was bypassed in the awarding of funds.

**From the viewpoint of the federal office, it is in fact too early to tell. The federal program officers are currently in the process of identifying which sites were exemplary. After this is done, they may try to use these projects as demonstration sites for state purposes.

from the mainstream of reading practices in the state, needy of better technical assistance than OE can provide, and, hence, uninfluential.

Of the ten states represented in the Right-to-Read sample, only two have contact with their school-based sites, one peripherally and one actively. In both cases the degree of involvement is perceived by the state as its own choice. The state with peripheral involvement had established prior to the federal program a large and active reading program, supported by state funds; Right-to-Read offered neither new direction nor significant amounts of money. Because of the size of the reading program, the Reading Division in this SEA can visit only 80 out of close to 1,000 projects each year; school-based sites are among those projects that may be visited. The Reading Division assumes the responsibility for coordinating reading instruction for all reading projects except for the school-based sites, which are regarded as "one less place to go." However, one person in their staff of 13 has the responsibility for disseminating information about all projects, both state and school-based sites.

In the state claiming active involvement with school-based sites, federal Right-to-Read funds represent the bulk of all monies spent on reading. The reading staff of the SEA describe themselves as technical assistants, and view their job as one which provides this specific service to all reading programs in the state.

In eight of our sample states, the SEA has no contact with the school-based sites. As would be expected in this situation, six of these Right-to-Read directors state that neither the federal program staff nor the federal guidelines had any effect on their state reading program; the state with the already highly developed reading program shared this opinion.

Of the three state Right-to-Read directors who described a positive federal program effect, two are from SEAs that have no contact with the school-based sites. Of these, one SEA had already initiated a statewide reading program; federal money helped bring the state program to fruition; federal guidelines were useful in directing school districts. The other two states used the Minnesota plan to model

their reading programs. Additionally, in these states, Right-to-Read money doubled (SEA reading) staff size.

When asked whether the management of the school-based sites would change if the state had a more active role in the program, four state Right-to-Read directors responded "no." Two state directors did not respond to the question; four state directors would change the management of the school-based projects if given the opportunity.

Of those content with OE management of the school-based sites, two were directors who found federal program staff and guidelines beneficial; another was from a state with so extensive a reading program that the SEA was pleased not to have additional responsibilities.

On the other hand, of the four states desirous of management change, one was also from a state with an extensive and well-developed reading program. In this instance, the state Right-to-Read director chafed at what he considered the redundant if not wasted federal effort that was going into the school-based sites. He stated that the "school-based sites are doing what (our) schools have been doing for years." This state is now in the process of pulling together the best components of all the state reading programs for dissemination. He concluded that state management of school-based sites would permit administration on a larger plan basis, thus allowing for more innovation and greater dissemination.

The remaining three state Right-to-Read directors desiring change wanted less to assume management than to have input to the management of these sites. They felt that lack of contact between the SEA and the project led to no dissemination impact because the school-based sites are isolated from the rest of the state (2 states) and provide poor technical assistance (3 states view federal technical assistance as very weak).

Highly correlated with wishing to change management of school-based sites is reported conflict with OE. A frequent complaint is that OE fails to notify the SEA about which LEA has received the Right-to-Read grant. Other problems concern role definition; the SEA wants to provide technical assistance to the school-based site and/or monitor the project. The SEA staff perceives OE as not allowing them to

function in this way. A very touchy problem, reported by one state, occurred when the state nominated a school as an exemplary right-to-read site and OE then made it a redirection site (i.e., a school willing to make the transition from an existing ineffective reading program to an effective reading program).

STATE LEGISLATION RELATED TO FEDERAL PROGRAMS

The Tally

Title VII. Seven out of eight states interviewed have or are considering legislation to authorize state funding for bilingual education. Two states require bilingual education for certain districts (e.g., districts with at least 20 students whose natural language is not English). Two other states fund bilingual programs that are voluntary on the part of school districts. SEAs in three states without current bilingual education legislation are contemplating legislation in the near future, and two states are working on legislation that would expand existing programs.

VEA, Part D. Of the twelve states interviewed, three have either passed on or are considering legislation about implementing career education.

Title III. Four states have legislation which authorizes funds for programs similar to Title III. One state (California) has legislation that directs how Title III funds are to be spent.

Right-to-Read. Many states have legislation concerning the subject matter of the program. However, only two of the ten states that were interviewed have considered legislation as a result of publicity about Right-to-Read. One SEA designed a bill to establish Right-to-Read programs in all LEAs; the bill was vetoed. In another SEA, an attachment to this year's budget bill reads that in order to receive state aid, all LEAs must have an adequate reading program in grades K-3. (The SEA establishes minimum requirements.)

Observations

Publicity about the program and management strategy of the state education staff are the variables most frequently implicitly cited for explaining legislative interest in a change agent program. Program publicity has been instrumental in passing legislation. For example, with one or two exceptions, there is general agreement that Title VII has been instrumental in "improving" the attitudes of politicians and education professionals toward bilingual education. Four respondents credited Title VII with stimulating state responsibility and providing models for state legislation and practice. State officers in Texas and New York emphasized the importance of Title VII in getting state legislation passed.

Several other SEAs are trying to build statewide support for their program in order to encourage new state legislation. For example, one SEA Title III staff is trying to get its state legislature to provide funds analogous to federal Title III funds. According to the Title III coordinator, Title III projects have "not had good publicity." In his opinion, not only does the state legislature not know about the program, but also, the hierarchy in the SEA does not regard Title III as important. In an effort to gain the attention of the legislature and of educators, the staff is taking three validated projects and making statewide presentations of them.

In another instance, the reading staff in SEA designed a bill to establish Right-to-Read programs in all LEAs. Although the bill passed the senate and house, the governor vetoed it. This staff is now trying to develop a broad base of support at the local level before resubmitting a bill.

For programs characterized by OE governance, state legislation can become a way of giving the SEA a power base.* Publicity becomes a part of the state's management strategy. In programs characterized by SEA governance, legislation often appears a function of how the program staff views its role.

---

*The SEA Title III cited above is in an analogous position to an "unrecognized" SEA in an OE-governed program.

Title III. Unlike the other change agent programs examined, Title III legislation specifies no programmatic goals. Constrained only by the priorities established in the mandated needs assessment, almost any kind of educational project can be undertaken. Subject to other constraints that are later discussed, this latitude gives the SEA program staff a unique opportunity to define their role--are they to be administrators of federal legislation or are they to be active participants in shaping and managing the state Title III program?

Because of the limitations inherent in telephone data collection, we are by no means offering a serious cause-and-effect analysis. Speculations upon the data are offered to open up further areas of inquiry for later fieldwork and data collection.

Eighteen Title III coordinators were asked what the goals of the program were in their state. Their answers were coded on a scale that ranged from specific to vague. The code "vague" covers such responses as "follow OE guidelines" and "meet critical education needs."

These responses may not indicate more than the interviewee's response to the telephone as a method for interviewing. However, taking this reservation into consideration, it is interesting to speculate upon specificity of response as an indication of state staff perception of their role in the program.

As Table 7 shows, in none of the states that responded "vague" to the question on program goals has the legislature shown a positive interest in the program.* These states we perceive as "administratively oriented." In five of the ten "program oriented" SEAs, the legislature has become involved with the program. In California, the legislature has specific mandates on the allocation of Title III money. In the other four states, the legislature has provided money for Title III-like programs. In two of these states, Title III legislation has been used as a model for state legislation. In each case, the state and federal programs complement each other. In one state,

*Before Title III, one of these states funded a program quite similar to Title III. When federal funds became available, state money was withdrawn.

Table 7

STATE LEGISLATURE ACTION CONCERNING TITLE III[a]

State[b]	Legislative Involvement in Program	Program-Oriented SEA	Administrative-Oriented SEA
A	X		
B	X		
C			X
D	X		
E			X
F			X
G			X
H			
I		X	
J			X
K	X		
L		X	
M	X		
N			X
O		X	
P		X	
Q			X
R		X	

[a]Questions 1, 4, 4a, 4b. See Appendix A.

[b]The names of the states are concealed to respect the privacy of the respondents.

the SEA uses federal Title III monies to fund large projects; the state provides $400,000 a year for a similar mini-grant program. Since the inception of Title III, another state has funded a research and development program designed to feed into Title III projects.

In five of what in our opinion are "program-oriented" SEAs, there has been no legislative interest in the program. Other information about political culture and traditions is needed to explain this situation. For example, one of these states, Massachusetts, has been described as dominated by the "religion of localism." In another, Texas, "the structural characteristics of Texas government and the traditional politics of education in Texas has precluded federal aid as a significant issue for the governor or legislature."* On the other hand, the active role of the California legislature in specifying how federal money is to be spent must be interpreted against the background of the political hostility between the legislature and the chief state school officer during the years 1962-1970.

Vocational Education. Of the twelve Vocational Educational states in our sample, in only three has there been legislation concerning career education. The SEA staffs in these states can be characterized as having a strong predisposition toward career education, and as building such successful models that their legislature appropriated additional money for spreading the concept of career education.** The initial strategy employed by these state program staffs was to put the state share of Part D money into the Commissioner's (i.e., the federal portion) project. Two of these SEAs are now concentrating on developing better evaluation techniques for career education programs.

The strategies of the other SEAs need more systematic inquiry. New York, for example, plans to get supportive legislation--but they will not approach the legislature until they are satisfied with their

---

*J. S. Berke and M. W. Kirst, *Federal Aid to Education*, D. C. Heath and Company, Lexington, Mass., 1972.

**One of these states, New Jersey, funded a career education project in Hackensack before the advent of federal funds. When Part D money became available, it was put into the Hackensack project. This model was so successful that the legislature is now considering mandating career education for the New Jersey school system.

model of career education. In another state, the legislature is more interested in the concept of career education than the SEA vocational education staff. This legislature has established a career guidance center, but "have not yet discovered Part D funds." In yet another state, the governor held a state-wide conference for policymakers to explore career education. What initiated this interest needs to be explored.

There is some evidence of a conflict between proponents of career education and persons associated with maintaining vocational education at both the state and LEA levels. "Career" advocates see vocational education as merely one aspect of their general subject, yet do not wish too close an identification for fear of alienating teachers in the more academic disciplines whom they see as the primary deliverers of career approaches. Vocational educators sometimes see career education as an upstart competitor for funds and attention. These conflicts tend to get reflected in administrative decisions and management styles.

III. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FEDERAL AND STATE PROGRAM STAFF

ATTITUDES TOWARD FEDERAL GUIDELINES

State program officers for Title III and VEA, Part D, were asked, "what effect, if any, has the federal program staff or the federal guidelines had on the nature of the program as you have implemented it here?"* State reactions to federal program guidelines were mixed.

Four Title III respondents remarked to the effect that they follow the guidelines to the letter, whereas another four noted that the guidelines were supportive. Individual states noted the following:

State 1: "The guidelines made LEAs aware of the need for change."

State 2: "Requirements kept money from being absorbed into a pool of funds for operations."

State 3: "The guidelines made us [the SEA] recognize our responsibility for being a change agent rather than a regulatory agency....The stress on evaluation motivated specialists [in the SEA] to appear who haven't before....The emphasis at the LEA level to evaluate caused increasing LEA sophistication. The stress on critical needs not only caused the state to perform a needs assessment, but also caused the local level to begin a rather sophisticated attempt to assess critical needs."

State 4: "If there were no link [a reference to the State Plan], the quality in the states would be much lower."

The remaining Title III coordinators found the federal guidelines too constraining. This chafing is not too surprising since Title III guidelines do specify managerial procedures to the states.

Responses of the VEA, Part D officers followed a somewhat similar pattern. These guidelines largely specify what the funds are to be used for; two respondents found the guidelines too restrictive about how the money could be spent. Another stated that if career education

*This question did not prove applicable for the Title VII and Right-to-Read programs for organizational reasons discussed in the introduction.

had not been specified, the state would not have a career education program; they would prefer to put the money into more vocational education projects. Two states remarked that they found the guidelines positive, a statement that one respondent amplified by explaining that the "guidelines made us [the SEA] more aware and definitive about what is exemplary." The remaining six state officers simply stated that they followed the guidelines closely.

CONFLICTS

As would be expected, there is a strong correlation between discomfort with guidelines and conflict between federal and state program staff. The five states that reported no conflict with OE (see Table 8) were also those states which expressed no difficulty with the guidelines. Only those programs in which OE utilizes a management-oriented approach to change in education reported *major* conflicts with the federal program staff.

Right-to-Read

Five of the ten Right-to-Read directors interviewed reported various degrees of conflict caused by OE's lack of consultation with the SEA over school-based site selection, technical assistance, and monitoring.

Title III

In Title III, the management of local projects is delegated to the SEA, but the *process* for managing projects is specified by OE. Complaints by the Title III coordinators often verge upon bitter.

IVD. Of the 18 state coordinators interviewed, 13 reported conflict with OE over federal management style. As Table 8 indicates, over half the states interviewed were angry about federal management of the Identification, Validation, and Dissemination instrument (IVD).

Table 8

SOURCES OF REPORTED CONFLICT WITH OE--TITLE III[a]

State[b]	Conflict	IVD	State Plan	Legislative Mandates	Managerial Style	Needs Assess-ment
A	✓					
B		✓	✓	✓		
C		✓				
D		✓				
E	✓					
F					✓	
G		✓	✓			
H		✓	✓			✓
I		✓	✓			
J	✓					
K		✓				
L	✓					
M	✓		✓			
N						✓
O					✓	
P		✓				
Q			✓			
R		✓				

[a]Because of the open-ended nature of the response, an area where no conflict is noted does not necessarily indicate lack of conflict over that item. The area may well be a source of conflict that was not cited by the respondent.

[b]The names of the states are concealed to respect the privacy of the respondents.

One state refused to participate in the federal IVD scheme, which was utilized for the first time in 1972. They saw this federal venture as a diluted version of their own successful program. And since OE was not putting any dissemination money into the plan, they saw no reason to participate. Two states complained that the panel of reviewers had to be out-of-state personnel. Yet another state used the IVD only under pressure from OE. As their coordinator described, "the plan only got to the I. [The states were responsible for identification] And the feds gave no money for the D."

Six other states expressed anger, not about the instrument itself or the procedures involved, but about the aftermath of the IVD procedure. These states uniformly described initial enthusiasm for the IVD and felt that this was the first time OE had taken an active leadership role in the program. Apparently, the states participated in what they thought was a validation procedure. However, because of internal problems in OE, other federal offices refused to recognize this particular validation procedure. As a result, the states described "the laborious IVD activity actively sabotaged by OE."

As one state described, "there is no consumer protection policy. Every office in Washington [e.g., NIE, Evans Committee, 306, Title III for States] has its own bag [validation procedure]." One state, for example, validated 12 projects. The Evans Committee would only review two of them, and rejected the others "because they weren't written up in the proper form." Another state described a project that had gone through five different validations in the past year. After each validation, the project was told the previous validation did not count.

In summary, federal policies about dissemination of successful projects have caused major conflicts between the states and the federal program staff. The states view federal policy as inadequate and inconsistent. Most states liked the idea of a validation procedure, and are using the results of the IVD even though they perceive "Washington [as] not using the results of anything."

In the aftermath of the IVD, many states are uncertain as to whether they will again participate in a national validation. Some plan to make the validation procedure an in-state operation. In what

will mean a major policy change, the New Jersey SEA Title III staff has asked the state legislature for $500,000 to disseminate procedures validated by a national validation procedure (the procedure to be chosen by their Advisory Council). They expect this legislation to be passed next year.

The State Plan. Legislation requires the states to submit annually a detailed plan describing how they will manage their program. Six of the Title III states interviewed reported conflict with OE over this procedure.* Respondents felt that an annual update of the old State Plan rather than a new plan each year would be both more meaningful and more practical. These states felt that the guidelines for writing a State Plan were too specific. They reported that this detailed direction led them either to create a "grammatical fiction" in order to get funding or to be led "to mediocrity and sameness by such specificity." One state regarded the state plan as OE's birch rod for paddling the state when federal program officers were displeased.

Other Conflicts. California reported conflict with OE over the fact that the state legislature has mandated use of Title III funds. Two states complained that SEA managerial style has become a source of dissention. In one state the problem concerns staff use in program administration. OE wants a specific Title III staff in the SEA, whereas the coordinator wishes to view the entire SEA as Title III staff. The other state, Kentucky, had problems with OE three years ago over regionalization of the state.**

Two states reported conflict with OE over the procedure to follow in performing a needs assessment.

---

*In response to question 3B, "In what way could the federal staff be more helpful?", states requested less rigid requirements. We can assume that in some instances their response refers to dissatisfaction with requirements (such as the State Plan) rather than conflict over these requirements.

**Title III monies in Kentucky go to regional projects rather than to school districts.

Vocational Education

Conflict between federal program staff and those VEA officers in the SEA has apparently occurred only in isolated instances. Only two states reported any instance of conflict. One SEA wished to transfer basic act money into the Part D program in order to implement a set of career education models. OE would not approve the transfer (the problem was solved by transferring monies from another federal source). Another SEA's reports that were sent to Washington were lost. Since the SEA assumed the reports had arrived (and were not notified otherwise), there was anger when they were not recognized in a national review based on these reports.

REACTIONS TO FEDERAL STAFF

Unmet Needs

Across all programs, there were three main areas in which state program staff felt the federal program staff could be more helpful. Greatest need was felt for:

1. *More contact, including on-site visits.* This request was universal from Title VII respondents. [See Sec. II, p. 4]
2. *OE to play a more active role in dissemination.* The lack of federal initiative regarding dissemination of Title III projects was discussed earlier. This request from VEA, Part D officials reflects the fact that the Part D program has no money for any systematic effort in dissemination; instead, federal staff has relied on ERIC as a major dissemination system. From SEA response, this has not been adequate.
3. *Making requirements less rigid.* More flexibility was requested most often by Title III coordinators. From the telephone survey data, it is impossible to tell whether the requirements are indeed too rigid or whether any externally imposed management style would elicit the same request.

Other areas of concern include:

4. *Improving the information lag.* A major theme in various forms was the need to improve the information flow from OE to the LEA. Variations include: have better coordination of communications in their own shop; give clear-cut answers when we ask for them rather than be delayed for several months; verify information before it is distributed to the states; give more lead time on guidelines (for state plans, proposals, etc.); and send periodic updates of federal staff phone numbers.
5. *Improving the finance lag or discontinuity.* Several states felt hamstrung by delays in receiving their funds. Uncertainty about if and when monies were to arrive not only hampered project planning, but also impacted on number of proposals received (see Sec. II).
6. *Allowing more SEA project participation.* As described in Sec. II, Right-to-Read and Title VII program officers feel most strongly about this.

Title VII. Perceptions of positive effects from Title VII were varied (see Table 1). SEAs credited Title VII for technical trailblazing where there previously had been only limited experience, especially in the development of materials.

Most SEAs felt that Title VII succeeded in demonstrating to detractors that bilingual classrooms is a workable concept, that kids can learn in their natural language without jeopardizing their eventual mastery of English. If claims for cognitive growth are somewhat equivocal, advances in self-esteem and attitudes toward school are not.

Most persons interviewed felt that Title VII had been instrumental in improving the attitudes of politicians and educators toward bilingual education. In Texas and New York, the importance of Title VII in getting legislation passed was emphasized, and three respondents credited Title VII with providing entry into the education professions for bilingual persons.

VEA, Part D. In response to the question, "is there anything they [the federal program staff] do which is particularly helpful," six of

the twelve program officers interviewed said "no." Three found the regional office helpful in answering administrative questions; two respondents noted good flow of information about career education activities in other states; one found the technical assistance provided helpful.

Title III. Two-thirds of the Title III coordinators found the federal program staff particularly helpful in answering administrative questions and being generally "supportive" of the state Title III activities. Five states reported enjoying the national conferences and workshops as an opportunity for sharing ideas with other states.

Right-to-Read. Four state program officers unequivocally stated that the Right-to-Read program had no impact. With two exceptions, the remaining states felt that national publicity about Right-to-Read had both massed public support and made the LEAs more receptive to reading programs sponsored by the SEA. Three states found the Right-to-Read materials useful.

IV. OBSERVATIONS

The SEA interviews provoke a number of questions relevant to the change agent study. Analyses of these data with that to be collected from SEA and LEA fieldwork and the survey questionnaires should provide insight into the following issues:

- The telephone interviews strongly indicate that SEA posture (i.e., types of projects funded, adherence to guidelines, and sophistication of needs assessment and planning) affects local programs. We need to systematically relate differences in SEA management styles and the relationship of SEA policies to the number, kind, and outcome of innovations undertaken by LEAs.
- A corollary to the above problem would be the need for federal policy recognition of the heterogeneity of SEA needs and expertise.

Other questions are more program specific:

OE-GOVERNED PROGRAMS

- What would the SEAs like to control if they were given some administrative funding and responsibility?
- What are the effects of SEA style and involvement in program operations at the site level? (For Right-to-Read, we would be able to investigate one case only.)
- How do SEAs and LEAs differ in attitude toward both the federal program and the staff?
- At what levels are SEA private agendas operative? (This question should be posed for all programs in the study.) For example, agendas may include such diverse elements as long term goals (e.g., transition vs. maintenance), political purposes that go beyond the explicit educational goals, and organizational pressures within the SEA.

Right-to-Read

Although some states have reported the beginning of interaction, most report that there is almost no relationship between SEAs and the federal Right-to-Read sites. Several issues are raised:

- The exclusion of SEAs from any form of participation in this part of the program does not seem to have been originally part of federal strategy. Federal literature discusses how the SEA will assist OE in both the planning stage for the selected sites, and in providing technical assistance. How did the current relationships evolve from this position?
- Many SEAs appear eager to provide technical assistance to the Right-to-Read school-based sites, and they report that these sites have requested assistance from them. Since this is a "free good" to federal administrators, why is this contact not permitted?
- To what degree can any federal "change agent" program afford to bypass the SEA in establishing new educational practices in the state?
- Additionally, many states reported extensive use of other federal funds (e.g., Titles II and III) for establishing their SEA reading programs. The data gathered in interviews hint that the impact of the Right-to-Read program in general, and school-based sites in particular, may be greater in inverse proportion to other state and federal money being invested in reading programs.

Title VII

- What are the private agendas of SEA's with respect to particular programs, and can federal program administrators take advantage of these agendas to produce more effective implementation in the same sense that we often recommend that managers take advantage of the private ambitions of individual subordinates? There is some indication that Title VII has been more successful in states where the SEAs assumed a

strong role but this SEA initiative occurred where the program held promise for the SEA's own priorities.

- In Texas prior to Title VII, for example, bilingual education was limited to a few border counties. There was sentiment for a statewide program, but there was also powerful opposition. Senator Yarbrough from Texas introduced legislation in Congress that ultimately resulted in Title VII. The Texas SEA took a strong role in Title VII in the early years when the program was most malleable (that is, when program personnel were relatively inexperienced and searching for models, and the program was suffering through initial organization pangs). Title VII personnel came to rely heavily on the Texas SEA, which in turn molded the program nearer to their needs. Today, Title VII is credited by the Texas SEA with making LEAs and politicians more receptive to bilingual education. Legislation has been passed, and LEAs "are now out of the debate stage and into hard planning."

  The Texas scenario was probably not the result of forethought by either Title VII or the SEA, but looking back, it appears that both agencies used each other, and Title VII seems to have effected change in Texas. The federal Title VII staff probably does not consider it a complete success, however, since Texas has held fast at a transition-oriented program, whereas the Title VII staff would prefer a cultural-maintenance focus.

- It has been noted that there were complaints from the states that the Title VII guidelines are too flexible to provide an effective instrument for control. In its recent process evaluation of Title VII,* Development Associates, Inc., reports that the guidelines "do not truly address the more operational or qualitative functions of day-to-day project management and control." One respondent in the SEA interviews

---

A Process Evaluation of the Bilingual Education Program, Title VII, ESEA, Development Associates, Inc., December 1973, p. 83.

suggested that the problem might be that the guidelines are necessarily generalized in order to accommodate the varying needs of bilingual education around the country. If so, the federal program office might consider developing several versions of the guidelines, each keyed to specific needs of different target populations. It is possible, of course, that the federal strategy is to avoid tying LEAs too closely to guidelines so that locally generated solutions might flourish. If this is the case, then perhaps the federal staff ought to heed the SEAs pleas for more site presence, if only to provide for dissemination of those home-grown solutions.

- Several respondents alleged that the federal program office is inappropriately vulnerable to "political pressures," or to considerations not directly relevant to needs of target children. It should be noted that restricted staffing and travel have kept the office on fairly nonintimate terms with conditions at project sites, whereas the political climate of Washington is inescapable. One might wonder to what extent vulnerability to inappropriate decision inputs is related to the relatively weak stimulus from the more important inputs. In other words, we may be observing not so much a poor choice of inputs, but a natural myopic affinity on the part of decisionmakers for inputs that are close at hand.

SEA-GOVERNED PROGRAMS

- To what degree are projects with a large funding base more successful (e.g., for demonstrating exemplary programs, for developing exportable ideas) than projects with less funding?
- As a result of their needs assessment, several Title III states have placed high priority on funding career education and multicultural education projects. How have these projects been related (if indeed there are any connections) to other change agent programs primarily concerned with these areas? Have these change agent programs stimulated an awareness that these areas are state needs?

- What effect, if any, does the State Plan have on SEA behavior? on project outcomes?
- How does SEA hostility to a concept (e.g., career education) affect project outcomes?
- Are there systematic differences in project outcomes between projects funded competitively and those funded on a noncompetitive basis?

Appendix A

DESCRIPTION OF THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

A telephone survey of SEA change agent program officers from the following programs was conducted at The Rand Corporation during January 1974: Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), Title III, Innovative Projects; ESEA Title VII, Bilingual Projects; Vocational Education Part D, Exemplary Programs; the Right-to-Read Program. In total, 48 persons from 18 states were interviewed.*

For the state Title III program, state coordinators were interviewed in all 18 sample states:

Arkansas	Missouri
California	New Jersey
Colorado	New York
Florida	North Carolina
Georgia	Ohio
Illinois	Pennsylvania
Kentucky	Texas
Massachusetts	Washington
Michigan	Wisconsin

Since the federal Title III program (306 funds) is funded and administered directly out of the Commissioner's office, there is no SEA administration of this program.

In the Right-to-Read program, the following states were interviewed:

California	New Jersey
Georgia	New York
Illinois	Ohio
Massachusetts	Wisconsin
Missouri	Texas

---

*For a description of the sample selection, see J. Pincus et al., *Revised Study Design and Progress Report for Change Agent Study*, The Rand Corporation, WN-8487-HEW, November 1973.

Title VII interviews were conducted in the following states:

California	Colorado
Florida	New Jersey
Michigan	New York
Massachusetts	Texas

The following SEAs were interviewed about VEA Part D projects:

Arkansas	New Jersey
California	New York
Florida*	North Carolina
Georgia	Ohio
Kentucky	Pennsylvania*
Missouri	Washington

In an approximately 60-minute interview,** program officers were asked about SEA project selection criteria and state management styles. All persons from whom we requested an interview responded. Two respondents did not wish to be interviewed by telephone; a questionnaire was mailed to them, which they filled out and returned.

The questionnaire contains both general questions concerning SEA characteristics and specific questions about the unique characteristics of each program. Since the extent of SEA involvement with OE-governed change agent programs was not known before the interviews, SEA officials from the Right-to-Read, Title VII, and VEA, Part D*** programs were queried about the nature of their involvement with the federal program in order to determine if the questionnaires were appropriate. Where appropriate, the questionnaire was either retained in whole or part, or questions were modified to fit the individual situation described. At the least, if the SEA had no, or very limited involvement in the program, the respondent was invited to discuss his views of the federal program and staff, what role the SEA would like to play in managing the program (if any), and why.

All interviewed were assured that their answers would be kept confidential. Some respondents indicated that this was not necessary

---

*Interviewed about the federally administered Part D funds only.

**Time of interview varied between 20 minutes and 2 1/2 hours; mean time was approximately one hour.

***The same person was interviewed for the state and federal portions of VEA, Part D funds.

whereas others needed repeated reassurance that their responses were not being taped.

THE QUESTIONS

This section discusses both problems and peculiarities associated with the survey instrument. Those questions that elicited responses we were not able to use in the data analysis are discussed. The information described can serve as a guide to (1) information collected in the questionnaire, but not used in this WN because of problems with comparability or incomplete information, and (2) the kinds of problems of which to be aware when doing fieldwork in the SEAs

SEA Characteristics

Q. 2. How many of the professional staff in your SEA are primarily concerned with the [ ] program?

For OE-governed programs, the answer most expected and most often received is "none." In the SEA-governed programs, a "none" response indicates that no one on the staff has primary responsibility for the program.

Depending upon the bureaucratic organization of the SEA, other units (e.g., research and development, dissemination) may have a significant input to the program--but not be primarily responsible for it.

Project Generation

Q. 8. (A & B): Peculiarities of proposal receipt were pointed out in Sec. II. In addition to indicating staff policy about how program monies are to be allocated, proposal funding can also be a function of SEA decisions about funding cycles, or SEA or LEA fears about federal discontinuities. For states which cited 1973 fiscal year funding as atypical, 1972 data were also collected.

If the number of proposals funded at the requested level of funding matches the number of proposals funded, either the SEA gave "guidelines" to the LEA about how much they could ask for, or the SEA helped the LEA write the proposal--hence, a mutually agreeable level of funding. Information descriptive of individual situations is captured in the questionnaire.

Project Operations

Of the 11 questions asked in this section, the responses to 6 of them were too questionable to use in the data analysis. This situation probably occurred because responses to questions about "project operations" could be interpreted as reflecting on the thoroughness or competence of the program staff.

Q. 16 (AB): With very few exceptions, the response to Q. 16 was an emphatic "yes." Either implicit tone or explicit statement conveyed the idea that if a person was not qualified to give technical assistance, he would not be on the staff. Therefore, the response to Q. 16A typically would mirror the answer given to Q. 2 (how many of the professional staff are primarily concerned with [ ] program). Proportion of their time spent visiting project sites (Q. 16B) seemed similarly distorted. The percentages given often seemed much greater than the response to Q. 14 (how often does someone from your office visit each project site?) would indicate.

Q. 18. Data concerning the number of times the SEA terminated projects was also collected. For some SEAs, it becomes a matter of policy to terminate a project that is not meeting its objectives; for others, project termination is a unique occurrence.

Termination does not necessarily occur at the SEA level. LEAs may decide to terminate projects for the same reasons as the SEA. Sometimes the SEA will not terminate a project without LEA approval. When this information was offered, it was recorded.

Q. 20. About how much of your past year's budget was used to support the dissemination activities of successful projects?

The percentages collected seem less a reflection of reality than an indication of either the SEAs perception of their dissemination activity or of their public relations about their involvement in project dissemination.

Q. 19, 21: These were closed-ended questions concerning techniques used to identify successful projects, and the role of the SEA in disseminating successful projects.

Almost all SEAs indicated all techniques mentioned. Either this is indeed an accurate reflection of reality, or some of the logic described above was operating.

Title III Only

Q. T2: What is the role of your Title III State Advisory Council?

Section 305 of the ESEA of 1965 identifies seven functions of State Advisory Councils and implies two others. These are:*

1. To advise the state educational agency on the annual preparation of the state plan;
2. To advise the state educational agency with regard to policy matters arising out of the administration of the state plan;
3. To develop criteria and procedures for the approval of projects submitted under the state plan;
4. To review each application submitted from local education agencies and to make recommendations to the state educational agency on the disposition of each project;
5. To evaluate the impact of the Title III program in the state as a whole;
6. To evaluate each project funded under Title III;
7. To prepare and submit through the state educational agency the report of its (a) yearly activities; (b) recommendations on improving the Title III program in the state and nation; (c) report of the evaluation of the Title III program in the state and each project funded under the state plan program. . . ;
8. To disseminate the results of evaluation of the program and projects. . . ;
9. To advise the state educational agency on the preparation of the state plan. . . .

The responses to Q. T2 were mixed. Some respondents merely commented that they followed OE guidelines. Others noted several points

*The following information is quoted from *State Advisory Councils: Policies and Procedures: A Report of the 1972 Nebraska Conference for ESEA Title III Advisory Councils*, Nebraska Department of Education, fall 1972, p. 5.

in response to this question and several additional points about the role of their advisory council during other parts of the survey. Perhaps a series of questions about State Advisory Council functions would have presented a complete picture, and hence more usable information.

OMB # 856-73022

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR SEA CHANGE AGENT PROGRAM OFFICERS

S	E	A			1-5/
					6-8/

■ CARD 01 9-10/

STATE NAME _____ [ ][ ] 11-12/

PROGRAM NAME _____ [ ] 13/

RESPONDENT NAME _____
LAST M.I. FIRST

TITLE _____

PHONE NUMBER _____

ADDRESS _____
STREET # STREET NAME

_____
CITY/TOWN STATE ZIP

DATE [ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] 14-19/
MO DAY YR

TIME BEGIN [ ][ ] : [ ][ ] 20-23/

CIRCLE ONE: AM..... 1 24/
PM..... 2

TIME END [ ][ ] : [ ][ ] 25-28/

CIRCLE ONE: AM..... 1 29/
PM..... 2

INTERVIEWER _____

ATTEMPTED CONTACTS: _____

_____

_____

_____

SEA CHARACTERISTICS

1. What are the goals of the [ ] program in your state?

_____ A [ ][ ] *30-31/*
_____ B [ ][ ] *32-33/*
_____ C [ ][ ] *34-35/*
_____ D [ ][ ] *36-37/*
_____

2. How many of the professional staff in your SEA are primarily concerned with the [ ] program?

[ ][ ] *38-39/*

3. What effect, if any, has the federal program staff or the federal guidelines had on the nature of the program as you have implemented it here?

_____ A [ ][ ] *40-41/*
_____ B [ ][ ] *42-43/*
_____ C [ ][ ] *44-45/*
_____ D [ ][ ] *46-47/*
_____

3A. Is there anything they do which is particularly helpful?

_____ A [ ][ ] *48-49/*
_____ B [ ][ ] *50-51/*
_____ C [ ][ ] *52-53/*
_____ D [ ][ ] *54-55/*
_____

3B. In what way could the federal staff be more helpful?--
(PROBE: Effective in communicating the program goals?)

_____ A [ ][ ] 56-57/
_____ B [ ][ ] 58-59/
_____ C [ ][ ] 60-61/
_____ D [ ][ ] 62-63/
_____

3C. Have there been any major conflicts with the federal program staff over the management of the state program? Describe them.

_____ A [ ][ ] 64-65/
_____ B [ ][ ] 66-67/
_____ C [ ][ ] 68-69/
_____ D [ ][ ] 70-71/
_____

4. What interest, if any, does the state legislature take in this program?

_____ A [ ][ ] 72-73/
_____ B [ ][ ] 74-75/
_____ C [ ][ ] 76-77/
_____ D [ ][ ] 78-79/
_____

■ CARD 02

4A. Has any legislature been passed which affects it?

_____ A [ ][ ] 11-12/
_____ B [ ][ ] 13-14/
_____ C [ ][ ] 15-16/
_____ D [ ][ ] 17-18/
_____

4B. What is its effect?

A			19-20/
B			21-22/
C			23-24/
D			25-26/

PROJECT GENERATION

5. Has your state performed a needs assessment?

YES...(GO TO Q.5A)..... 1 *27/*

NO...(GO TO Q.6)..... 2

5A. Are the results reflected directly in state priorities for funding?

YES..... 1 *28/*

NO..... 2

5B. Were you satisfied with the quality of the needs assessment?

YES..... 1 *29/*

NO..... 2

6. Do you assist districts in planning and developing new projects?

YES..... 1 *30/*

NO..... 2

7. Do you suggest priorities to local districts (by project type or target group) concerning which kinds of projects will be funded?

YES...(GO TO Q.7A)..... 1 *31/*

NO...(GO TO Q.8)..... 2

7A. Are these guidelines available?

YES...(GO TO Q.7B)..... 1 *32/*

NO...(GO TO Q.8)..... 2

7B. Can they be sent to Rand?

YES..... 1 *33/*

NO..... 2

8. How many proposals for new funding did you receive during the past year?

☐, ☐☐☐ 34-37/

8A. How many were funded?

☐☐☐ 38-40/

8B. How many were funded at the requested level of funding?

☐☐☐ 41-43/

PROJECT SELECTION

9. Do you use outside readers to evaluate project proposals?

YES...(GO TO Q.9A)..... 1 *44/*
NO...(GO TO Q.10)..... 2

9A. Who selects them?

_____ A [ ][ ] *45-46/*
_____ B [ ][ ] *47-48/*
_____ C [ ][ ] *49-50/*
_____ D [ ][ ] *51-52/*

10. Are standard rating forms used to evaluate proposals?

YES...(GO TO Q.10A)..... 1 *53/*
NO...(GO TO Q.11)..... 2

10A. Is a single score developed for each proposal?

YES..... 1 *54/*
NO..... 2

10B. Can a blank form be sent to Rand?

YES..... 1 *55/*
NO..... 2

11. Who makes the final decision on which project will be funded?

_____ A [ ][ ] *56-57/*
_____ B [ ][ ] *58-59/*
_____ C [ ][ ] *60-61/*
_____ D [ ][ ] *62-63/*

12. Are there geographic distribution quotas or other political guidelines used in selecting projects to fund?

YES..... 1 64/

NO..... 2

13. What type of pressure, if any, do you receive from special interest groups to fund specific projects?

_____ A [ ][ ] 65-66/

_____ B [ ][ ] 67-68/

_____ C [ ][ ] 69-70/

_____ D [ ][ ] 71-72/

PROJECT OPERATIONS

14. How often does someone from your office visit each project site?

_____ ☐☐☐ *73-75/*
_____

15. What is the purpose of these visits?

■ *CARD 03*

_____
_____ A ☐☐ *11-12/*
_____ B ☐☐ *13-14/*
_____ C ☐☐ *15-16/*
_____ D ☐☐ *17-18/*

16. Are any of the people on your staff qualified to give technical assistance on curriculum matters to new projects?

YES...(GO TO Q.16A)..... 1 *19/*
NO...(GO TO Q.17)..... 2

16A. How many?

OF PEOPLE ☐☐ *20-21/*

16B. How much of their time is spent visiting project sites?

% ☐☐ *22-23/*

17. How do you monitor the progress of each project?

_____
_____ A ☐☐ *24-25/*
_____ B ☐☐ *26-27/*
_____ C ☐☐ *28-29/*
_____ D ☐☐ *30-31/*
_____

18. Have any projects been terminated, before their planned completion date, for poor performance?

YES...(GO TO Q.18A)..... 1 32/
NO...(GO TO Q.19)..... 2

18A. What were the circumstances?

_____ A [ ][ ] 33-34/
_____ B [ ][ ] 35-36/
_____ C [ ][ ] 37-38/
_____ D [ ][ ] 39-40/
_____

19. Which of the following techniques are used to identify successful projects: CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.

Evaluation reports..... 1 41/
Review panels..... 2 42/
Reputation..... 3 43/
Other..... 8 44/

20. About how much of your past year's budget was used to support the dissemination activities of successful projects?

A. $ [ ], [ ][ ][ ], [ ][ ][ ] 45-51/

OR

B. % [ ][ ] 52-53/

21. What role do you play in disseminating successful projects; CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.

Validation of projects..... 1 54/
Workshops or seminars..... 2 55/
Produce materials..... 3 56/

22. Is there a formal dissemination plan?

YES...(GO TO Q.22A)..... 1 57/
NO...(GO TO Q.23)..... 2

22A. Can a copy be sent to Rand?

YES..... 1 58/
NO..... 2

23. Which one of all your projects has been most widely disseminated?

▶ PROJECT NAME _____ | | | | | | | | | 59-66/

LOCATION _____

23A. Can you provide us with the names and locations of other districts which have adopted that project?

YES..... 1 67/
NO...(GO TO Q.24)..... 2

(IF ONLY A FEW, LIST HERE)

▶ PROJECT NAME _____ | | | | | | | | | 68-75/

LOCATION _____

■ CARD 04

▶ PROJECT NAME _____ | | | | | | | | | 11-18/

LOCATION _____

▶ PROJECT NAME _____ | | | | | | | | | 19-26/

LOCATION _____

▶ PROJECT NAME _____ | | | | | | | | | 27-34/

LOCATION _____

24. What has been the major impact of this program on educational practices in your state?

_____ A [ ][ ] 35-36/

_____ B [ ][ ] 37-38/

_____ C [ ][ ] 39-40/

_____ D [ ][ ] 41-42/

_____

TITLE III ONLY

T1. Were any projects in your state validated as successful through the IVD procedure?

YES..... 1 *43/*

NO..... 2

T2. Are you satisfied with the IVD instrument as a mechanism for validating project success?

YES..... 1 *44/*

NO..... 2

T3. What is the role of your Title III State Advisory Council?

_____ A *45-46/*

_____ B *47-48/*

_____ C *49-50/*

_____ D *51-52/*

T4. Who nominates Council members?

_____ A *53-54/*

_____ B *55-56/*

_____ C *57-58/*

_____ D *59-60/*

T5. Who selects them?

_____ A *61-62/*

_____ B *63-64/*

_____ C *65-66/*

_____ D *67-68/*

T6. Can you provide us with the names and locations of Title III projects which have been picked for fourth year continuation funding by the state?

▶ PROJECT NAME _____ | | | | | | | | | 69-76/

LOCATION _____

■ CARD 05

▶ PROJECT NAME _____ | | | | | | | | | 11-18/

LOCATION _____

▶ PROJECT NAME _____ | | | | | | | | | 19-26/

LOCATION _____

▶ PROJECT NAME _____ | | | | | | | | | 27-34/

LOCATION _____

▶ PROJECT NAME _____ | | | | | | | | | 35-42/

LOCATION _____

T7A. Are there reading scores available for those projects in which reading improvements was a principal objective?

YES...(GO TO T7B)..... 1 43/
NO...(GO TO Q.T8)..... 2

T7B. Can they be sent to Rand?

YES..... 1 44/
NO..... 2

T8. Can a copy of the State Plan be sent to Rand?

YES..... 1 45/
NO..... 2

VOC ED ONLY

V1. What, in your mind, are the attributes of a good career education project?

_____ A [ ][ ] *46-47/*

_____ B [ ][ ] *48-49/*

_____ C [ ][ ] *50-51/*

_____ D [ ][ ] *52-53/*

V2A. Comparing the federally administered Part D project and the largest of the state administered projects in career education, which do you think was more successful?

[ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ][ ] *54-61/*

V2B. Why?

_____ A [ ][ ] *62-63/*

_____ B [ ][ ] *64-65/*

_____ C [ ][ ] *66-67/*

_____ D [ ][ ] *68-69/*

V3A. Does your office attempt to promote the concept of career education among the LEA's in your state?

YES...(GO TO Q.V3B)..... 1 *70/*

NO...(GO TO Q.V4)..... 2

V3B. How?

_____ A [ ][ ] *71-72/*

_____ B [ ][ ] *73-74/*

_____ C [ ][ ] *75-76/*

_____ D [ ][ ] *77-78/*

V4A. Will your state make grants to LEA's to continue career education when the federal program terminates?

YES..... 1 79/

NO..... 2

V4B. Why is that?

■ CARD 06

_____ A [ ][ ] 11-12/

_____ B [ ][ ] 13-14/

_____ C [ ][ ] 15-16/

_____ D [ ][ ] 17-18/

RIGHT-TO-READ ONLY

R1. How would the management of projects change if the state had a more active role in the program?

_____ A [ ][ ] 19-20/

_____ B [ ][ ] 21-22/

_____ C [ ][ ] 23-24/

_____ D [ ][ ] 25-26/

_____

R2. Are there reading scores available for your projects which can be sent to Rand?

YES..... 1 27/

NO..... 2

BILINGUAL ONLY

B1. How would the management of projects change if the state had a more active role in this project?

_____	A	*28-29/*
_____	B	*30-31/*
_____	C	*32-33/*
_____	D	*34-35/*
_____		

PROJECT	DISTRICT	A. How familiar are you with each of the following projects?
36-37/ ☐☐	38-39/ ☐☐	40/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3
43-44/ ☐☐	45-46/ ☐☐	47/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3
50-51/ ☐☐	52-53/ ☐☐	54/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3
57-58/ ☐☐	59-60/ ☐☐	61/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3
64-65/ ☐☐	66-67/ ☐☐	68/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3
71-72/ ☐☐	73-74/ ☐☐	75/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3
78-79/ ■CARD 07 ☐☐	11-12/ ☐☐	13/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3

B. How would you rank the success of each of these projects?	C. What is the reputation of the districts these projects are in?
41/ Very successful--perfect model project.. 1 Somewhat successful but many problems... 2 Not successful..... 3 Don't know..... 4	*42/* Innovative..... 1 Average..... 2 Conservative..... 3 Don't know..... 4
48/ Very successful--perfect model project.. 1 Somewhat successful but many problems... 2 Not successful..... 3 Don't know..... 4	*49/* Innovative..... 1 Average..... 2 Conservative..... 3 Don't know..... 4
55/ Very successful--perfect model project.. 1 Somewhat successful but many problems... 2 Not successful..... 3 Don't know..... 4	*56/* Innovative..... 1 Average..... 2 Conservative..... 3 Don't know..... 4
62/ Very successful--perfect model project.. 1 Somewhat successful but many problems... 2 Not successful..... 3 Don't know..... 4	*63/* Innovative..... 1 Average..... 2 Conservative..... 3 Don't know..... 4
69/ Very successful--perfect model project.. 1 Somewhat successful but many problems... 2 Not successful..... 3 Don't know..... 4	*70/* Innovative..... 1 Average..... 2 Conservative..... 3 Don't know..... 4
76/ Very successful--perfect model project.. 1 Somewhat successful but many problems... 2 Not successful..... 3 Don't know..... 4	*77/* Innovative..... 1 Average..... 2 Conservative..... 3 Don't know..... 4
14/ Very successful--perfect model project.. 1 Somewhat successful but many problems... 2 Not successful..... 3 Don't know..... 4	*15/* Innovative..... 1 Average..... 2 Conservative..... 3 Don't know..... 4

PROJECT	DISTRICT	A. How familiar are you with each of the following projects?
16-17/ ☐☐	18-19/ ☐☐	20/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3
23-24/ ☐☐	25-26/ ☐☐	27/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3
30-31/ ☐☐	32-33/ ☐☐	34/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3
37-38/ ☐☐	39-40/ ☐☐	41/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3
44-45/ ☐☐	46-47/ ☐☐	48/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3
51-52/ ☐☐	53-54/ ☐☐	55/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3
58-59/ ☐☐	60-61/ ☐☐	62/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3

B. How would you rank the success of each of these projects?	C. What is the reputation of the districts these projects are in?
21/	*22/*
Very successful--perfect model project.. 1	Innovative..... 1
Somewhat successful but many problems... 2	Average..... 2
Not successful..... 3	Conservative..... 3
Don't know..... 4	Don't know..... 4
28/	*29/*
Very successful--perfect model project.. 1	Innovative..... 1
Somewhat successful but many problems... 2	Average..... 2
Not successful..... 3	Conservative..... 3
Don't know..... 4	Don't know..... 4
35/	*36/*
Very successful--perfect model project.. 1	Innovative..... 1
Somewhat successful but many problems... 2	Average..... 2
Not successful..... 3	Conservative..... 3
Don't know..... 4	Don't know..... 4
42/	*43/*
Very successful--perfect model project.. 1	Innovative..... 1
Somewhat successful but many problems... 2	Average..... 2
Not successful..... 3	Conservative..... 3
Don't know..... 4	Don't know..... 4
49/	*50/*
Very successful--perfect model project.. 1	Innovative..... 1
Somewhat successful but many problems... 2	Average..... 2
Not successful..... 3	Conservative..... 3
Don't know..... 4	Don't know..... 4
56/	*57/*
Very successful--perfect model project.. 1	Innovative..... 1
Somewhat successful but many problems... 2	Average..... 2
Not successful..... 3	Conservative..... 3
Don't know..... 4	Don't know..... 4
63/	*64/*
Very successful--perfect model project.. 1	Innovative..... 1
Somewhat successful but many problems... 2	Average..... 2
Not successful..... 3	Conservative..... 3
Don't know..... 4	Don't know..... 4

PROJECT	DISTRICT	A. How familiar are you with each of the following projects?
65-66/ ☐☐	67-68/ ☐☐	69/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3
72-73/ ☐☐	74-75/ ☐☐	76/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3
79-80/ ■CARD 08 ☐☐	11-12/ ☐☐	13/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3
16-17/ ☐☐	18-19/ ☐☐	20/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3
23-24/ ☐☐	25-26/ ☐☐	27/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3
30-31/ ☐☐	32-33/ ☐☐	34/ Very familiar..... 1 Somewhat familiar..... 2 Not familiar..... 3

B. How would you rank the success of each of these projects?	C. What is the reputation of the districts these projects are in?
70/	*71/*
Very successful--perfect model project.. 1	Innovative..... 1
Somewhat successful but many problems... 2	Average..... 2
Not successful..... 3	Conservative..... 3
Don't know..... 4	Don't know..... 4
77/	*78/*
Very successful--perfect model project.. 1	Innovative..... 1
Somewhat successful but many problems... 2	Average..... 2
Not successful..... 3	Conservative..... 3
Don't know..... 4	Don't know..... 4
14/	*15/*
Very successful--perfect model project.. 1	Innovative..... 1
Somewhat successful but many problems... 2	Average..... 2
Not successful..... 3	Conservative..... 3
Don't know..... 4	Don't know..... 4
21/	*22/*
Very successful--perfect model project.. 1	Innovative..... 1
Somewhat successful but many problems... 2	Average..... 2
Not successful..... 3	Conservative..... 3
Don't know..... 4	Don't know..... 4
23/	*29/*
Very successful--perfect model project.. 1	Innovative..... 1
Somewhat successful but many problems... 2	Average..... 2
Not successful..... 3	Conservative..... 3
Don't know..... 4	Don't know..... 4
35/	*36/*
Very successful--perfect model project.. 1	Innovative..... 1
Somewhat successful but many problems... 2	Average..... 2
Not successful..... 3	Conservative..... 3
Don't know..... 4	Don't know..... 4

Review list of materials to be sent to:

The Rand Corporation
Attention: Linda Prusoff
1700 Main Street
Santa Monica, California 90406

CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY:

	YES	NO
Evaluations	1	2
Guidelines as to state priorities	1	2
Proposal Evaluation form	1	2
Dissemination plan	1	2
List of districts adopting widely disseminated projects	1	2
Reading scores for Title III or Right-To-Read	1	2
Any newsletter or other publication which might be of use to this study	1	2

Appendix B

SEA MANAGEMENT OF VEA STATE-ADMINISTERED PART D FUNDS

The responses of each state to the survey instrument are summarized below. As much as possible, the following points are covered:

- Generation of projects
  - Project Applications
    - Methods of Solicitation
    - Guidelines
    - Technical Assistance
- Project Selection
  - Selection Process
  - Criteria Used
- Management of Projects
  - Monitoring
  - Technical Assistance
- Project Dissemination and Continuation Policies

Because of differences in quality of response, the degree of description for each state varies. Sometimes the responses of the interviewee raise further questions. Time constraints of a telephone survey did not permit all leads to be immediately followed up. However, many probes for later fieldwork are implicit.

State 1:

Generation of Projects. The goal of this SEA is to solicit a proposal from each LEA. To accomplish this, each LEA is notified about the availability of Part D monies and is sent a copy of the state plan. If the LEA does not respond with a proposal, a member of the SEA staff is sent to the LEA to find out what is happening.

A result of this tactic is seen in the number of proposals received and funded. For fiscal year 1973, 700 proposals out of 1500 was funded.

Project Selection. The staff characterizes itself as "dealing in a freewheeling developmental mode." Outside readers are not used to evaluate project proposals because "they only cause headaches." Grants are not awarded on a competitive basis; the staff "goes on instinct." If they think it will be a good project, they fund it.

Management of Projects. Each project is assigned a monitor, who is available on call. In addition, there is a constant monitoring process--both on-site visits (at least once a month) and some independent evaluation.

Dissemination and Project Continuation Policies. Less than five percent of last year's budget was used to support dissemination activities of successful projects. This money was used to produce materials.

The aim of the SEA is for all projects to carry themselves within the school districts tax levy budget. Therefore, the staff policy is to completely fund a project for three years--but not any longer. They feel that if a project is successful, the LEA will continue it.

State 2:

Generation of Projects. Unlike State 1, proposals are not encouraged from each LEA; instead, the staff "controls" who submits proposals. The high level of interaction between LEA and SEA is evident in the data obtained on number of proposals received and funded. Three proposals were received, and three funded--all at the requested level of funding.

Project Selection. Since the staff participates in writing the proposals, standardized selection procedures per se are not followed. Staff policy is to fund only large projects, and only projects in which the LEA will also make financial commitment.

Management of Projects. In its early stages, a project is visited once a week; visits decrease over the span of the project. These field visits are not only to provide technical assistance but also maintain contact with students, teachers, and parents--to follow their reactions to the project. In addition, each project is required to have a citizens advisory committee, which is composed of students, parents, and educators. In addition to technical assistance provided by the staff, the SEA has a Department of Curriculum and Media Development that also provides this service.

Dissemination and Project Continuation Policies. According to the respondent, this staff is very involved in dissemination activities--both sponsoring workshops and producing materials. However, dissemination of Part D projects does not necessarily come from Part D funds.

Each county in the state has a coordinator of career education projects, who is assigned to the Office of the County Superintendent of Schools. We need to gather more information on his function.

LEAs are expected to continue career education projects after federal funding terminates. To promote this policy, LEAs must show good faith by partially funding Part D projects from their inception.

State 3:

Project Selection. A division in the SEA, but outside the vocational education staff, evaluates proposals on a standard rating form and ranks the projects using a single score. The Assistant Director of Research, Survey, Evaluation and Exemplary Programs begins funding proposals, starting at the top of the list and working down. (Proposals funded are typically funded at their requested level of funding since SEA funding guidelines are initially given to the LEAs.) Projects are funded until Part D money runs out. If a district is not funded and "they scream," money is pulled from somewhere else, and the project gets funded.

Management of Projects. Before the energy crisis, projects were visited at least twice a year. These visits were used for monitoring, initiating inservice meetings, and assisting the project with any local red tape it might encounter. Project progress is checked via semi-annual project reports and by third party evaluation.

Dissemination and Project Continuation Policies. The SEA attempts to spread the concept of career education to LEAs through promotional materials and reports in the superintendent's newsletter. When the federal program terminates, the SEA will make grants to LEAs to continue career education because the staff is committed to this concept.

State 4:

Generation of Projects. If a district wants Part D money, they notify the SEA, who meet with the LEA to develop a prospectus. If the SEA has a particular project it wants to develop with Part D funds, it will find a LEA willing to accommodate the SEA's plans.

Although the CSSO has made career education a priority area, the SEA Vocational Education staff "is not convinced that career education is important." The chief of the Program Services Unit described it as "like an airplane with two wings on one side and none on the other." This attitude is reflected in the fact that there is no specific staff assignment for Part D.

Project Selection. The prospectus serves as a proposal. Since there is very close SEA staff involvement while the project is being developed, almost all "proposals" are funded. There were ten districts which expressed an interest in Part D funds; eight received funding; seven at the requested level.*

Management of Projects. Projects are visited either once or twice a year to see if there is a "good indication they will attain project objectives." The SEA has an extensive staff of subject matter supervisors and a statewide consulting system for areas where the staff has no expertise. When asked how much of their time is spent visiting project sites, the reply was "almost none."

---

*One project had to be cut back in funding because after LEA-SEA negotiations, something "illegal" was found in the prospectus, and this part of the project was eliminated.

No Part D projects have been terminated before their planned completion data because of poor performance.

Dissemination and Project Continuation Policies. All dissemination must come from individual projects. So far, the SEA has had no dissemination activities for projects; however, they are in the process of developing a dissemination network, which will include Part D projects.

Given program staff attitudes, it is not surprising that grants will not be given to LEAs to continue career education when the federal program terminates.

State 5:

If career education had not been specified, this state would never have instituted it. The staff prefers to have more vocational education projects.

Project Selection. A Vocational Education Advisory Committee (comprised of three staff members from the CSSO's office, two members of the SEA vocational technical institute) selects both projects and level of funding.

Management Projects. Projects are "lucky if [we visit them] once a year." Visits are to provide assurance that the SEA is interested. "I try hard to let them know I'm not snooping--How they run their project is their responsibility."

According to the respondent, no one on the staff is qualified to give technical assistance on curriculum matters to new projects; the SEA staff policy is "not to interfere with the progress of a project."

No projects have been terminated by the SEA before their planned completion date. However, two projects drifted away because of internal problems. "They didn't ask for more money and [therefore] didn't get it."

Dissemination and Project Continuation Policies. The SEA has no consistent policy about making grants to LEAs for continuing career education projects when the federal program terminates. The respondent observed that in his state, the smaller funding base of the project, the more likely the project was to continue.

State 6:

Generation of Projects. This SEA staff extensively supports the concept of career education. They sponsor a program to invite officials from LEAs to come to meetings to hear about career education; they offer money to the LEA staff to develop proposals for Part D funds.

Project Selection. Outside readers chosen by SEA staff Part D officers evaluate proposals; the State Director of Vocational Education makes the final decision. Of 15 proposals for new funding in fiscal year 1973, six were funded, none at the requested level of funding.

Management of Projects. Projects are visited once a month. At this time project finances are reviewed, authorizations given for new purchases, and administrative questions answered.

The progress of these projects is monitored through these monthly visits and one formal annual evaluation.

No projects have been terminated before their planned completion date because of poor performance.

Dissemination and Project Continuation Policies. The program staff allocates money to successful projects to produce materials for dissemination.

In most cases, LEAs have exhibited a need for funding after the federal funding has terminated. Program staff policy is to make grants (somewhat less than the federal funds) so that the LEA can complete its goal.

State 7:

Generation of Projects. Typically, the Director of Exemplary Programs (on the Vocational Education staff) solicits proposals for Part D funds. For fiscal year 1973, of the six proposals for new funding, all but two were requested. All were funded--all but one at the requested level of funding.

Project Selection. The Director of Exemplary Programs makes the final decision on which project will be funded. In his words, "I haven't turned down a project yet."

Management of Projects. Projects are visited once every two months to offer supervision and suggestions for project improvement. Monitoring takes place by reading quarterly reports, monthly financial statements, and on-site visits.

No projects have been terminated before their planned completion date because of poor performance.

Dissemination and Project Continuation Policies. About six percent of the fiscal year 1973 budget supported dissemination activities of successful projects. Career education days are held at one of the state's most successful Part D projects; the SEA brings in educators from LEAs to observe this project.

The SEA will not make grants to LEAs to continue career education when the federal program terminates. Career education projects are developed to become part of the regular curriculum and therefore do not need additional funding.

State 8:

In this state, Part D funds are regarded as a minor responsibility, and there is not much state staff involvement in this program. In fiscal year 1973, LEAs were told that there was no money for career education projects; then "$10,000 was found." As a result, only two proposals for funding were received; one project was funded.

Project Selection. Projects are funded on the recommendation of the staff.

Management of Projects. Projects are visited approximately once every three months to see if the project is following its objectives.

Dissemination and Project Continuation Policies. Dissemination of projects is completely conducted by the LEA.

When federal funding terminates, the SEA will not make grants to the LEAs to continue career education project because "too many need grants." The program staff feels that the LEA is responsible for continuing the project.

State 9:

Project Selection. Projects are selected by the Vocational Education staff.

Management of Projects. In this state, there are both monthly and quarterly monitoring sessions. In addition to staff on-site visits, they use a third party evaluator.

One project has been terminated before its planned completion date because its project leader refused to participate in a staff development program.

Dissemination and Project Continuation Policies. Vocational Education and Title III funds are combined to disseminate the results of successful projects. The SEA funds Project Install, a project designed to sponsor workshops and produce materials about successful projects.

In the project design, all that cannot become a part of the school is eliminated in order to make it easy to maintain the project after the termination of federal funds. For this reason, the state will not make grants to LEAs when federal funds cease.

State 10:*

Management of Projects. Projects are visited at least six times per quarter. The function of these visits is project monitoring. Technical assistance is available from the Bureau of Curriculum Development in the SEA.

Dissemination and Project Continuation Policies. Approximately one percent of the fiscal year 1973 budget was spent supporting the dissemination activities of successful projects; five percent of the budget will be used in fiscal year 1974. Unlike other Part D programs, the SEA is involved in a program to validate successful projects.

At this time, federal funding has not terminated in any of the career education programs. The program staff hopes to make grants "when the time comes."

---

*In this state, the interview only lasted 25 minutes; information collected was scanty.